REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 10-12 and 14-16 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended in the telephone interview on February 20, 2004. Applicant indicated that the Office Action was improperly made final, because the grounds of rejection for claim 3 was changed from obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Examiner stated that the new grounds of rejection was necessitated by Applicant challenging Official Notice taken in the Office Action issued July 17, 2003. However, this does not change the fact that the grounds of rejection for claim 3 was actually changed and that the new grounds of rejection were not necessitated by **amendment**. Applicant maintains that the finality of the Office Action issued on December 31, 2003, is improper. Therefore, the Office Action issued on December 31, 2003, should be treated as a non-final Office Action.

Applicant also argued that Jawahar et al. (US Patent No. 6,298,356) does not teach or suggest sending an HTTP message in an unedited form to a customer-side browser and sending the same HTTP message **in an edited form** to an agent-side browser. Examiner noted that Jawahar et al. teaches receiving the HTTP message and forming a composite display with the HTTP message being presented in a frame. Note **FIG. 6**. Applicant maintains that the HTTP message is sent to the agent-side browser in **unedited** form and the agent-side browser presents the HTTP message in the frame. That is, Jawahar et al. does not teach or suggest "sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser," as recited in representative claim 1.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 10-12, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Jawahar et al. U.S. Patent No. 6298356 (hereinafter Jawahar). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, the Office Action states:

> Referencing claim 1, Jawahar teaches
> (a) receiving, at the information terminal support server, an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request, (e.g. col. 21, lines 18-44, "*...client requests are re-directed through the session host...*");
> (b) determining whether or not said HTTP message agrees with a predetermined condition, (e.g. col. 8, lines 25-40, "*filter*" & col. 22, lines 4-30, "*conditions, filter*");
> (c) editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition, (e.g. col. 7, lines 53-65 & col. 13, lines 10-53, "*modified to include information about the customer*");
> (d) sending said HTTP message in an unedited form to the customer-side browser, (e.g. col. 18, line 56-col. 19, line 2, & col. 12, lines 4-32); and
> (e) sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser, (e.g. col. 7, lines 53-65 & col. 13, lines 10-53, "*modified to include information about the customer*").

Office Action, dated December 31, 2003. Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Jawahar* teaches methods and apparatus for enabling dynamic resource collaboration. A collaboration session is established between a first client and a second client. In response to the first client issuing a request, including a uniform resource locator (URL), the response is received and cached in the session host. A second URL, pointing to the cached response, is sent to the second client.

Jawahar also teaches a Web server 66 that includes a filter 68. The filter modifies web pages, served by Web server 66. Filter service 68 may change Web page content, e.g., by adding JavaScript methods, to allow the coordination and exchange of information between customer and agent browser applications. *Jawahar* teaches that the purpose of filter service 68 is to ensure the customer and the agent view the same information. See *Jawahar*, col. 8, lines 20-39.

In contradistinction, the present invention provides a method for collaboration between a customer-side browser and an agent-side browser, wherein a response from a Web server may be edited in an information terminal support server in response to the response agrees with a predetermined condition. Claim 1 recites:

> 1. An information processing method in an information processing system having an information terminal support server which supports

collaboration of a browser loaded on a customer-side information terminal and a browser loaded on an agent-side information terminal, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) receiving, at the information terminal support server, an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request;

(b) determining whether or not said HTTP message agrees with a predetermined condition;

(c) editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition;

(d) sending said HTTP message in an unedited form to the customer-side browser; and

(e) sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser.

Jawahar does not teach or suggest determining whether an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request agrees with a predetermined condition and "editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action cites seemingly arbitrary, albeit lengthy, portions of *Jawahar*. The cited portions of *Jawahar* seem to teach a feature of editing the URL in a request from a customer so that the agent browser receives a cached page. This is not equivalent to the presently claimed invention, which recites, "receiving, at the information terminal support server, an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request," "editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition," and "sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser." Whether the HTTP message in *Jawahar* is cached or not, the agent receives the same content as the customer. This is in contrast to the presently claimed invention that sends the HTTP message to the customer in an **unedited** form and sends the HTTP message to the agent in an **edited** form.

Jawahar does teach an agent-side display that presents an HTTP message that is also presented on a customer-side browser. That is, the agent client receives a copy of the HTTP message that the customer is viewing on the customer client and presents this page at the agent client in frame **192** of display **190**, see **FIG. 6** of *Jawahar*. However, this display is generated at the agent client in *Jawahar*. See *Jawahar*, col. 13, lines 13-15. The HTTP message is received at the agent client in **unedited form**. Therefore,

Jawahar fails to teach or fairly suggest "sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser," as recited in claim 1.

The applied reference fails to teach each and every claim limitation; therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Jawahar*. Independent claims 10 and 14 recite subject matter addressed above with respect to claim 1 and are allowable for the same reasons. Since claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 15, and 16 depend from claims 1, 10, and 14, the same distinctions between *Jawahar* and the invention recited in claims 1, 10, and 14 apply for these claims. Additionally, claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 15, and 16 recite other additional combinations of features not suggested by the reference.

More particularly, with respect to claim 2, the Office Action states:

> Referencing claim 2, Jawahar teaches editing is carried out to insert a command for a client program loaded on the agent-side information terminal, (e.g. col. 10, lines 1-18, "*synchronization*" & 19, lines 11-50, "*POST*").

Office Action, dated December 31, 2003. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Office Action cites seemingly arbitrary, albeit lengthy, portions of the reference. The cited portions do indeed teach a "synchronization service" and a "POST method." However, the Office Action proffers no analysis as to why this is somehow equivalent to carrying out editing to insert a command for a client program loaded on the agent-side information terminal, as recited in claims 2, 11, and 15. The cited portions make no mention of a client program being loaded on the agent-side information terminal and, as stated above, *Jawahar* simply does not teach editing the HTTP message before sending the message to the agent-side browser. The applied reference fails to teach each and every claim limitation; therefore, claims 2, 11, and 15 are not anticipated by *Jawahar*.

With respect to claim 3, the Office Action states:

> As per claim 3, as interpreted by the examiner, Jawahar teaches said command is one of "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field", (e.g. col. 18, line 56-col. 19, line 50, "*URL sharing may be undesirable or impossible if the customer request includes information that is not or should not be readily available to the agent. An HTTP client request includes a method or command that describes the action to be taken on the URL by the server. One such method is the POST method. The POST method enables a customer-client to communicate additional information other than the URL to the server.*").

Office Action, dated December 31, 2003. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The Office Action cites a seemingly arbitrary, albeit lengthy, portion of the reference. The cited portion does teach that the customer-client may communicate additional information that is **not** a URL to the server. However, the Office Action proffers no analysis as to why this is somehow equivalent to carrying out editing to insert a command for a client program loaded on the agent-side information terminal where the command is one of "form submit prohibition," "form alteration prohibition," "concealment of specific form," or "concealment of specific field," as recited in claims 3, 12, and 16. The cited portions make no mention of a client program being loaded on the agent-side information terminal. Thus, it follows that *Jawahar* does not teach the further limitations in claims 3, 12, and 16. The applied reference fails to teach each and every claim limitation; therefore, claims 3, 12, and 16 are not anticipated by *Jawahar*.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 10-12, and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Furthermore, *Jawahar* does not teach, suggest, or give any incentive to make the needed changes to reach the presently claimed invention. *Jawahar* actually teaches away from the presently claimed invention because it teaches that the customer and the agent view the **same** Web page with the **same** information, as opposed to sending an HTTP message to the customer in an **unedited** form and sending the HTTP message to the agent in an **edited** form, as in the presently claimed invention. Absent the Office Action pointing out some teaching or incentive to implement *Jawahar* to send an edited form of an HTTP message from a Web server to an agent browser, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to modify *Jawahar* to reach the present invention when the reference is examined as a whole. Absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive to modify *Jawahar* in this manner, the presently claimed invention can be reached only through an improper use of hindsight using the applicants' disclosure as a template to make the necessary changes to reach the claimed invention.

III. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the prior art of record and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: March 1, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen R. Tkacs
Reg. No. 46,430
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Agent for Applicants